

1 [Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 OAKLAND DIVISION

11

12

13 IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
14 ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
15 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

16 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

17 Case No. 4:23-cv-05448-YGR

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-md-03047-YGR

**MOTION TO STRIKE CERTAIN
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES IN META'S
AMENDED ANSWER TO THE
MULTISTATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
COMPLAINT**

Hearing:

Date: March 21, 2025

Time: 9:00 AM

Place: Oakland Courthouse, Courtroom 1

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on March 21, 2025 at 9 a.m., before the Honorable
3 Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, in Courtroom 1, Floor 4, of the United States District Court, Northern
4 District of California, located at 1301 Clay Street in Oakland, California, the State Attorneys
5 General (“State AGs”), will and hereby do move this Court, under Federal Rule of Civil
6 Procedure 12(f), for an order striking eight of the affirmative defenses from Meta’s Amended
7 Answer to the Multistate Attorneys General Complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 167 at 87 (Affirmative and
8 Other Defenses ¶¶ 1, 11, 14, 24, 41, 46, 47, and 50).

9 This Motion is based on the Memorandum of Points and Authorities submitted herewith,
10 any Reply or other papers submitted in connection with the Motion, any matter of which this
11 Court may properly take judicial notice, and any information presented at argument.

Dated: February 3, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marissa Roy

*Attorney for the People of the State of
California*

Additional counsel listed on signature pages

1 INTRODUCTION

2 The State Attorneys General (“State AGs”) move to strike eight affirmative defenses
 3 asserted by Meta¹ that are legally barred or otherwise precluded in this civil law-enforcement
 4 action—an action that seeks penalties, injunctive relief, and disgorgement of ill-gotten gains in
 5 connection with Meta’s extremely lucrative, deceptive, and injurious scheme to addict children to
 6 its various social-media platforms (e.g., Instagram and Facebook) and collect children’s data in
 7 violation of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act. *See* Meta’s Am. Answer to Multistate
 8 AG Compl. (“Answer”), Dkt. No. 167 at 87 (“Affirmative and Other Defenses”).

9 Although most—if not all—of the over 50 affirmative defenses that Meta raises are
 10 deficient or defective in some way, the State AGs move to strike only a subset of three categories
 11 that plainly fail as a matter of law. First, Meta asserts two equitable defenses—unclean hands
 12 (¶ 11)² and laches (¶ 50)—that are not legally cognizable in a public law-enforcement action, like
 13 this, without specific and serious allegations of governmental or prosecutorial misconduct. Meta
 14 does not—nor could it—make any such allegations. Second, Meta asserts four defenses—unjust
 15 enrichment (¶ 24); acquiescence, settlement, and release (¶ 41); indemnification (¶ 46); and setoff
 16 (¶ 47)—that are not cognizable because the State AGs have specifically (and repeatedly)
 17 disclaimed seeking restitutionary relief or damages on behalf of individuals and others. *See, e.g.*,
 18 MDL Dkt. No. 618 at 7.³ Third, Meta raises two defenses—personal jurisdiction (¶ 1) and puffery
 19 (¶ 14)—which have either been waived or already ruled on by this Court in substantially denying
 20 Meta’s motion to dismiss back in October 2024. *See* MDL Dkt. No. 1214 at 37–40.

21 Permitting Meta to maintain defenses that are legally inapplicable, incognizable, or
 22 precluded in this public law-enforcement action would prejudice the State AGs by inviting
 23 irrelevant discovery and unnecessary motion practice. For these reasons, the State AGs

24 ¹ “Meta” collectively refers to Meta Platforms, Inc.; Instagram, LLC; Meta Payments,
 25 Inc.; and Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC.

26 ² Paragraph citations refer to Meta’s numbering of its defenses starting on page 87 of its
 27 Answer (“Affirmative and Other Defenses”).

28 ³ “The State Attorneys General do not intend to seek restitution in a form that is measured
 29 by the amount of money expended by individuals, state agencies, or the States as a result of
 30 Meta’s alleged misconduct. The State Attorneys General intend to seek statutory civil penalties,
 31 among other remedies.”

1 respectfully request that the Court strike these eight defenses from Meta's Answer (¶¶ 1, 11, 14,
 2 24, 41, 46, 47, 50).

3 **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

4 Rule 12(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure empowers the Court to "strike from a
 5 pleading any insufficient defense." An affirmative defense may be stricken as insufficient as a
 6 matter of pleading, *see Wyshak v. City Nat'l Bank*, 607 F.2d 824, 827 (9th Cir. 1979), or a matter
 7 of law, *see In re Hanford Nuclear Reservation Litig.*, 534 F.3d 986, 999–1000 (9th Cir. 2008);
 8 *Ganley v. Cnty. of San Mateo*, No. 06-03923, 2007 WL 902551 at *1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2008)
 9 ("Motions to strike . . . are proper when a defense is insufficient as a matter of law."). A motion to
 10 strike affirmative defenses, though disfavored, is appropriate where, as here, "the matter to be
 11 stricken clearly could have no possible bearing on the subject of the litigation." *Platte Anchor*
 12 *Bolt, Inc. v. IHI, Inc.*, 352 F. Supp. 2d 1048, 1057 (N.D. Cal. 2004). "The function of a 12(f)
 13 motion to strike is to avoid the expenditure of time and money that must arise from litigating
 14 spurious issues by dispensing with those issues prior to trial." *Whittlestone v. Handi-Craft Co.*,
 15 618 F.3d 970, 973 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal citation and quotation marks omitted).

16 "In the Ninth Circuit, motions to strike are proper, even if the material is not prejudicial to
 17 the moving party, if granting the motion would make trial less complicated or otherwise
 18 streamline the ultimate resolution of the action." *Ganley*, 2007 WL 902551, at *2; *see also, e.g.*,
 19 *Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Kraus USA, Inc.*, 313 F.R.D. 572, 575 (N.D. Cal. 2016) ("[A]
 20 motion to strike an insufficient affirmative defense does not require a prejudice showing.");
 21 *Bottoni v. Sallie Mae, Inc.*, No. 10-03602, 2011 WL 3678878, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2011)
 22 ("A showing of prejudice is not required to strike an 'insufficient' portion of the pleading . . .").
 23 And as this District has explained, "[e]ven if prejudice were required, the burden of conducting
 24 discovery regarding irrelevant and unsustainable affirmative defenses constitutes such prejudice."
 25 *Hartford Underwriters Ins.*, 313 F.R.D. at 575 (internal quotation marks omitted).

ARGUMENT

I. Defenses that Are Inapplicable to Government Enforcement Actions Must Be Stricken.

4 The State AGs have brought a civil law-enforcement action against Meta that is inherently
5 different from a private action. A civil action brought by a public prosecutor for unfair or
6 deceptive acts or practices is “a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
7 benefit private parties.” *City & Cnty. of San Francisco v. PG & E Corp.*, 433 F.3d 1115, 1125–26
8 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *People v. Pac. Land Rsch. Co.*, 569 P.2d 125, 129 (Cal. 1977)); *see also*,
9 *e.g.*, *Rhino Linings USA, Inc. v. Rocky Mountain Rhino Lining, Inc.*, 62 P.3d 142, 149 (Colo.
10 2003); *Quattrocchi v. Georgia*, 850 S.E.2d 432, 436 (Ga. App. 2020). These enforcement actions
11 are “fundamentally different from a class action or other representative litigation.” *Payne v. Nat'l
12 Collection Sys., Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1045 (2001); *see also*, *e.g.*, *Tiismann v. Linda Martin
13 Homes Corp.*, 637 S.E.2d 14, 17 (Ga. 2006). As public prosecutors, the State AGs’ interests and
14 right to pursue a civil law-enforcement action “is separate from, and not derivative of” that of
15 private plaintiffs. *City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 433 F.3d at 1127; *see also*, *e.g.*, *State ex rel.
16 Edmisten v. Challenge, Inc.*, 284 S.E.2d 333, 339 (N.C. Ct. App. 1981) (noting that public
17 enforcement of the North Carolina Unfair or Deceptive Trade Practices Act is intended to
18 advance the public interest “rather than to redress individual grievances”); *Lightfoot v.
19 MacDonald*, 544 P.2d 88, 90 (Wash. 1976) (recognizing the Attorney General’s ability to bring a
20 consumer protection action for the benefit of the public and noting, “[t]he Attorney General’s
21 responsibility in bringing cases of this kind is to protect the public from the kinds of business
22 practices which are prohibited by the statute; it is not to seek redress for private individuals”
23 (quoting *Seaboard Sur. Co. v. Ralph Williams’ Nw. Chrysler Plymouth, Inc.*, 504 P.2d 1139, 1143
24 (Wash. 1973))). Accordingly, the State AGs may pursue claims without being subject to the same
25 defenses as plaintiffs in a class action and may pursue remedies unavailable to (and thus
26 unaffected by) those plaintiffs.

A. Unclean Hands and Laches Are Equitable Defenses and Thus Not Cognizable Against Public Prosecutors, Absent Allegations of Misconduct.

The availability of equitable defenses, like unclean hands and laches, against the government “are strictly limited.” *Sec. & Exch. Comm’n v. Elecs. Warehouse, Inc.*, 689 F. Supp. 53, 73 (D. Conn. 1988) (citing *Heckler v. Cnty. Health Serv.*, 467 U.S. 51, 60 (1983); *Schweiker v. Hansen*, 405 U.S. 785, 788 (1981)); accord, e.g., *Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Debt Sols., Inc.*, No. 06-00298, 2006 WL 2257022, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 7, 2006) (“[E]quitable defenses are unavailable to a party seeking to avoid a governmental entity’s exercise of statutory power.”).

Relevant here, “[f]ederal courts have routinely held that estoppel, laches, and unclean hands are not recognized affirmative defenses against the government in a civil suit to protect a public interest, absent outrageous conduct.” *Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Green Equitable Sols.*, No. 22-06499, 2023 WL 7107273, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2023) (citing *Watkins v. U.S. Army*, 875 F.2d 699, 707 (9th Cir. 1989) (en banc)); *see also, e.g., United States v. Ruby Co.*, 588 F.2d 697, 703 (9th Cir. 1978) (equitable defenses “may lie against the government” only where “affirmative misconduct”); *Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Medicor LLC*, No. 01-01896, 2001 WL 765628, at *3 (C.D. Cal. June 26, 2001) (“Some courts have held that the defense of unclean hands can be asserted against the government when the government’s conduct is so outrageous as to cause constitutional injury.”); *Elecs. Warehouse, Inc.*, 689 F. Supp. at 73 (“Where courts have permitted equitable defenses to be raised against the government, they have required that the agency’s misconduct be egregious and the resulting prejudice to the defendant rise to a constitutional level.”).

Meta makes no allegations whatsoever of affirmative misconduct by the State AGs—“outrageous” or otherwise—to support either an unclean hands or laches defense, nor could Meta. For its unclean hands defense, Meta alleges only that “Plaintiffs’ claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrine of unclean hands, including to the extent Plaintiffs’ claims are brought despite violations by users of Meta’s Terms of Service and/or Terms of Use.” (¶ 11). Aside from the recitation of the defense, the only misconduct Meta alludes to is by private

1 individuals, not the State AGs. The laches defense is even more bare: “Plaintiffs’ claims are
 2 barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrine of laches to the extent that Plaintiffs
 3 unreasonably delayed before pursuing their purported claims.” (¶ 50). Delay cannot be asserted
 4 against the government acting in the public right absent allegations of misconduct. *See Bresson v.*
 5 *Comm’r of Internal Revenue*, 213 F.3d 1173, 1176 (9th Cir. 2000) (“It was well settled that [the
 6 government] is neither bound by state statutes of limitations nor is subject to the defense of
 7 laches . . .”).

8 Even if these equitable defenses were cognizable in this public law-enforcement action
 9 (which they are not), this District has previously rejected Meta’s “single-sentence references”
 10 because they “do not provide sufficient notice ‘even under the most liberal of pleading standards,’
 11 much less under the additional pleading requirements for asserting equitable defenses against the
 12 government.” *Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, No. 22-04325, 2022 WL 16637996, at
 13 *8 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2022) (quoting *MIC Prop. & Cas. Corp. v. Kennolyn Camps, Inc.*, No. 15-
 14 00589, 2015 WL 4624119, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2015), and citing *Watkins*, 875 F.2d at 706).
 15 Accordingly, the Court should strike Meta’s equitable affirmative defenses, which include
 16 unclean hands (¶ 11) and laches (¶ 50).

17 **B. Defenses Related to Restitution and Damages Are Inapplicable.**

18 Meta cannot seek to offset or reduce the State AGs’ monetary remedies (i.e., civil
 19 penalties and disgorgement) by eventual recoveries that may be obtained by private individuals or
 20 others. As public law enforcers, the State AGs are statutorily entitled to broader relief than private
 21 plaintiffs. *See People of the State of Cal. v. IntelliGender, LLC*, 771 F.3d 1169, 1181–82 (9th Cir.
 22 2014) (“Because the State action is brought on behalf of the people, it implicates the public’s
 23 interest as well as private interests, and therefore the remedial provisions sweep more broadly.”).
 24 The resolution of actions brought by private plaintiffs cannot thus be used to bind the State AGs
 25 in their public law-enforcement capacity. *Id.* at 1177. While the Ninth Circuit has recognized that
 26 an award of restitution to private plaintiffs may offset recovery of restitution in public law-
 27 enforcement actions under “longstanding principles of preclusion,” this does not prevent

1 government enforcers from “seek[ing] civil penalties and broad injunctive relief.” *Id.* at 1181–82.
 2 Civil penalties are statutory remedies for government enforcers only—distinct from restitution
 3 owed to private plaintiffs, not duplicative. *See Am. Bankers Mgmt. Co., Inc. v. Heryford*, 885 F.3d
 4 629, 632 (9th Cir. 2018) (“[O]nly a public prosecutor . . . may pursue civil penalties.”). That civil
 5 penalties are statutory entitlements is also why they cannot qualify as unjust enrichment. *Cf.*
 6 *Aguilar v. Zep Inc.*, No. 13-00563, 2014 WL 4245988 at *19 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2014) (rejecting
 7 an unjust enrichment defense against remedies set out in statute because “[p]rinciples of equity
 8 cannot be used to avoid a statutory mandate”).

9 Meta’s attempt to use concurrent private actions against it to limit the State AGs’
 10 remedies in this civil law-enforcement action is improper. Meta invokes this tactic in four
 11 affirmative defenses: unjust enrichment (¶ 24); acquiescence, settlement, and release (¶ 41);
 12 indemnification (¶ 46); and setoff (¶ 47). They all have a common aim: to limit the State AGs’
 13 recovery by what might be recovered by private plaintiffs and others in separate actions. For
 14 example, Meta’s defenses at ¶¶ 46 and 47 attempt to offset the amount to which the State AGs are
 15 statutorily entitled based on any damages award or indemnification to private plaintiffs. Meta’s
 16 defense at ¶ 24 implies that users will be unjustly enriched by relief to the State AGs—even
 17 though the State AGs only seek forms of relief to which private individuals and entities are not
 18 entitled. And ¶ 41 seeks to limit the State AGs’ claims in the event of a settlement or release from
 19 private plaintiffs.

20 These attempts to bind the State AGs based on the potential outcomes in other actions are
 21 improper because the State AGs seek only the public remedies to which they are statutorily
 22 entitled as government enforcers: civil penalties, disgorgement, and injunctive relief. The State
 23 AGs have specifically and repeatedly disclaimed restitutionary and damage theories that might
 24 otherwise be offset by private recovery. *See, e.g.*, MDL Dkt. No. 618 at 7 (“The State Attorneys
 25 General do not intend to seek restitution in a form that is measured by the amount of money
 26 expended by individuals, state agencies, or the States as a result of Meta’s alleged misconduct.
 27 The State Attorneys General intend to seek statutory civil penalties, among other remedies.”).

1 Whatever is sought by plaintiffs in private actions to recover for their injuries cannot bear as a
 2 matter of law on the State AGs' entitlement to statutory civil penalties or disgorgement in a law-
 3 enforcement action. For these reasons, this Court should strike Meta's defenses of unjust
 4 enrichment (¶ 24); acquiescence, settlement, and release (¶ 41); and indemnification (¶ 46); and
 5 setoff (¶47).

6 **II. Arguments Already Disposed of by the Court Cannot Be Revived as Affirmative
 7 Defenses.**

8 Meta cannot resurrect arguments that it either waived or lost on a motion to dismiss as
 9 affirmative defenses. First, Meta raises an untimely personal-jurisdiction defense, alleging that
 10 “[w]ith respect to every action originally brought in a court located outside California, Meta avers
 11 that this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over it” (¶ 1). As a factual matter, none of the
 12 remaining State AGs in this MDL brought claims in a court outside California—but even if they
 13 had, Meta has waived objections to personal jurisdiction by not first raising them in its
 14 substantially denied motion to dismiss the State AGs' complaint. *See* MDL Dkt. No. 517 at 66–69
 15 (objecting to personal jurisdiction only as to the Florida Attorney General); *see also* Fed. R. Civ.
 16 Proc. 12(h)(1); *Peterson v. Highland Music, Inc.*, 140 F.3d 1313, 1319 (9th Cir. 1998) (“Rule
 17 12(h)(1) specifies the minimum steps that a party must take in order to preserve a [personal-
 18 jurisdiction] defense.”).

19 Second, Meta attempts to recast one of its motion-to-dismiss arguments—that the State
 20 AGs failed to state a deception claim because the statements at issue were puffery or opinion—as
 21 an “affirmative defense” (¶ 14), but this Court already addressed and rejected this argument in
 22 ruling on Meta's substantially denied motion to dismiss. MDL Dkt. No. 1214 at 37–40. In that
 23 Order, this Court held that Meta's “representations are part of a cohesive whole which, as alleged,
 24 form a deceptive scheme by Meta to obfuscate the risks of serious harm stemming from platform
 25 use” such that “the Court cannot say that Meta's statements all constitute nonactionable puffery.”
 26 *Id.* at 40. Accordingly, Meta already raised these arguments in its motion to dismiss as a basis for
 27 the State AGs failing to state a claim. Rejected failure-to-state-a-claim arguments, however,

1 cannot be recast as affirmative defenses. *See, e.g., Winns v. Exela Enter. Sols., Inc.*, No. 20-
 2 06762, 2021 WL 5632587 at *3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 1, 2021) (“[F]ailure to state a claim is not an
 3 affirmative defense.”); *Fabian v. LeMahieu*, No. 19-00054, 2020 WL 3402800 at *4 (N.D. Cal.
 4 June 19, 2020) (striking an “affirmative defense [that] appears to be another way of stating that
 5 [the plaintiff] has failed to state a claim”). The Court should therefore also strike Meta’s
 6 affirmative defenses of personal jurisdiction (¶ 1) and puffery (¶ 14).

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 For these reasons, the State AGs request that the Court strike eight of Meta’s affirmative
 9 defenses (¶¶ 1, 11, 14, 24, 41, 46, 47, and 50).

10 Dated: February 3, 2025

11 Respectfully submitted,

12 **ROB BONTA**
 13 Attorney General
 State of California

14 /s/ Marissa Roy
 15 Nicklas A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)
 16 Senior Assistant Attorney General
 Bernard Eskandari (CA SBN 244395)
 Emily Kalanithi (CA SBN 256972)
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 Megan O’Neill (CA SBN 343535)
 Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer (CA SBN
 33642)
 Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)
 Nayha Arora (CA SBN 350467)
 Brendan Ruddy (CA SBN 297896)
 David Begin (CA SBN 356401)
 Deputy Attorneys General
 California Department of Justice
 Office of the Attorney General
 455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
 Phone: (415) 510-4400
 Fax: (415) 703-5480
 marissa.roy@doj.ca.gov

27 *Attorneys for the People of the State of
 California*

1 **KRIS MAYES**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of Arizona

4 /s/ Laura Dilweg
 5 Laura Dilweg (AZ No. 036066, CA No.
 6 260663)
 7 Chief Counsel - Consumer Protection and
 8 Advocacy Section
 9 Nathan Whelihan (AZ No. 037560, CA No.
 10 293684), *pro hac vice*
 11 Assistant Attorney General
 12 Arizona Attorney General's Office
 13 2005 North Central Avenue
 14 Phoenix, AZ 85004
 15 Phone: (602) 542-3725
 16 Fax: (602) 542-4377
 17 Laura.Dilweg@azag.gov
 18 Nathan.Whelihan@azag.gov

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

20 **PHILIP J. WEISER**
 21 Attorney General
 22 State of Colorado

23 /s/ Krista Batchelder
 24 Krista Batchelder, (CO Reg.45066), *pro hac*
 25 *vice*
 26 Deputy Solicitor General
 27 Shannon Stevenson (CO Reg. 35542), *pro*
 28 *hac vice*
 29 Solicitor General
 30 Elizabeth Orem (CO Reg. 58309), *pro hac*
 31 *vice*
 32 Assistant Attorney General
 33 Colorado Department of Law
 34 Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center
 35 Consumer Protection Section
 36 1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
 37 Denver, CO 80203
 38 Phone: (720) 508-6384
 39 krista.batchelder@coag.gov
 40 Shannon.stevenson@coag.gov
 41 Elizabeth.orem@coag.gov

42 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex*
 43 *rel. Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*

1 **WILLIAM TONG**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of Connecticut

4 /s/ Lauren H. Bidra
 5 Lauren H. Bidra
 6 (CT Juris No. 440552), *pro hac vice*
 7 Special Counsel for Media and Technology
 8 Krislyn M. Launer
 9 (CT Juris No. 440789), *pro hac vice*
 10 Assistant Attorney General
 11 Connecticut Office of the Attorney General
 12 165 Capitol Avenue
 13 Hartford, Connecticut 06106
 14 Phone: 860-808-5306
 15 Fax: 860-808-5593
 16 Lauren.Bidra@ct.gov
 17 Krislyn.Launer@ct.gov

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Connecticut*

19 **KATHLEEN JENNINGS**
 20 Attorney General
 21 State of Delaware

22 /s/ Marion Quirk
 23 Marion Quirk (DE Bar 4136)
 24 Director of Consumer Protection
 25 Ryan Costa (DE Bar 5325)
 26 Deputy Director of Consumer Protection
 27 Delaware Department of Justice
 28 820 N. French Street, 5th Floor
 29 Wilmington, DE 19801
 30 Phone: (302) 683-8810
 31 Marion.Quirk@delaware.gov
 32 Ryan.Costa@delaware.gov

33 *Attorneys for the State of Delaware*

1 **ANNE E. LOPEZ**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of Hawai‘i

4 /s/ Christopher T. Han
 5 Christopher J.I. Leong (HI JD No. 9662) *pro*
 6 *hac vice*
 7 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 8 Kelcie K. Nagata (HI JD No. 10649) *pro hac*
 9 *vice*
 10 Christopher T. Han (HI JD No. 11311) *pro*
 11 *hac vice*
 12 Deputy Attorney General
 13 Department of the Attorney General
 14 425 Queen Street
 15 Honolulu, HI 96813
 16 Christopher.ji.leong@hawaii.gov
 17 Kelcie.k.nagata@hawaii.gov
 18 Christopher.t.han@hawaii.gov
 19 Phone: (808) 586-1180

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Hawai‘i*

21 **RAÚL R. LABRADOR**
 22 Attorney General
 23 State of Idaho

24 /s/ Nathan Nielson
 25 Nathan H. Nielson (ID Bar No. 9234)
 26 *pro hac vice*
 27 Deputy Attorney General
 28 Attorney General’s Office
 29 P.O. Box 83720
 30 Boise, ID 83720-0010
 31 (208) 334-2424
 32 nathan.nielson@ag.idaho.gov

33 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Idaho*

1 **KWAME RAOUL**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of Illinois

4 */s/ Matthew Davies*
 5 Susan Ellis, Chief, Consumer Protection
 6 Division
 7 (IL Bar No. 6256460)
 8 Greg Grzeskiewicz, Chief, Consumer Fraud
 9 Bureau (IL Bar No. 6272322)
 10 Jacob Gilbert, Deputy Chief, Consumer
 11 Fraud Bureau (IL Bar No. 6306019)
 12 Matthew Davies, Assistant Attorney
 13 General, Consumer Fraud Bureau (IL Bar
 14 No. 6299608), *pro hac vice*
 15 Emily María Migliore, Assistant Attorney
 16 General, Consumer Fraud Bureau (IL Bar
 17 No. 6336392)
 18 Kevin Whelan, Assistant Attorney General,
 19 Consumer Fraud Bureau (IL Bar No.
 20 6321715), *pro hac vice*
 21 Daniel B. Roth, Assistant Attorney General,
 22 Consumer Fraud Bureau (IL Bar No.
 23 6290613), *pro hac vice*
 24 Office of the Illinois Attorney General
 25 115 S. LaSalle Street
 26 Chicago, Illinois 60603
 27 312-814-2218
 28 Susan.Ellis@ilag.gov
 29 Greg.Grzeskiewicz@ilag.gov
 30 Jacob.Gilbert@ilag.gov
 31 Matthew.Davies@ilag.gov
 32 Emily.Migliore@ilag.gov
 33 Kevin.Whealan@ilag.gov
 34 Daniel.Roth@ilag.gov

35 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State
 36 of Illinois*

37 **THEODORE E. ROKITA**
 38 Attorney General State of Indiana

39 */s/ Scott L. Barnhart*
 40 Scott L. Barnhart (IN Atty No. 25474-82),
 41 *pro hac vice*
 42 Chief Counsel and Director of Consumer
 43 Protection
 44 Corinne Gilchrist (IN Atty No. 27115-53),
 45 *pro hac vice*
 46 Section Chief, Consumer Litigation
 47 Mark M. Snodgrass (IN Atty No. 29495-49),
 48 *pro hac vice*
 49 Deputy Attorney General
 50 Office of the Indiana Attorney General
 51 Indiana Government Center South
 52 302 West Washington St., 5th Floor
 53 Indianapolis, IN 46203
 54 Telephone: (317) 232-6309
 55 Scott.Barnhart@atg.in.gov
 56 Corinne.Gilchrist@atg.in.gov
 57 Mark.Snodgrass@atg.in.gov

58 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

1 **RUSSELL COLEMAN**
 2 Attorney General
 3 Commonwealth of Kentucky

4 /s/ J. Christian Lewis
 5 J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),
 6 *pro hac vice*
 7 Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No. 96748),
 8 *pro hac vice*
 9 Zachary Richards (KY Bar No. 99209),
 10 *pro hac vice*
 11 Daniel I. Keiser (KY Bar No. 100264),
 12 *pro hac vice*
 13 Matthew Cocanougher (KY Bar No. 94292),
 14 *pro hac vice*
 15 Assistant Attorneys General
 16 1024 Capital Center Drive, Ste. 200
 17 Frankfort, KY 40601
 18 Christian.Lewis@ky.gov
 19 Philip.Heleringer@ky.gov
 20 Zach.Richards@ky.gov
 21 Daniel.Keiser@ky.gov
 22 Matthew.Cocanougher@ky.gov
 23 Phone: (502) 696-5300
 24 Fax: (502) 564-2698

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the Commonwealth of*
 26 *Kentucky*

27 **LIZ MURRILL**
 28 Attorney General
 1 State of Louisiana

2 /s/ Asyl Nachabe
 3 Asyl Nachabe (LA Bar No. 38846)
 4 *Pro hac vice*
 5 Assistant Attorney General
 6 Louisiana Department of Justice
 7 Public Protection Division
 8 Consumer Protection Section
 9 1885 N. Third St.
 10 Baton Rouge, LA 70802
 11 Tel: (225) 326-6400
 12 NachabeA@ag.louisiana.gov
 13 *Attorney for State of Louisiana*

14 **AARON M. FREY**
 15 Attorney General
 16 State of Maine

17 /s/ Michael Devine
 18 Michael Devine (Maine Bar No. 5048), *pro*
 19 *hac vice*
 20 Assistant Attorney General
 21 Office of the Maine Attorney General
 22 6 State House Station
 23 Augusta, ME 04333-0006
 24 (207) 626-8829
 25 michael.devine@maine.gov

26 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Maine*

27 **ANTHONY G. BROWN**
 28 Attorney General
 1 State of Maryland

2 /s/ Elizabeth J. Stern
 3 Philip D. Ziperman (Maryland CPF No.
 4 9012190379), *pro hac vice*
 5 Deputy Chief, Consumer Protection
 6 Division
 7 Elizabeth J. Stern (Maryland CPF No.
 8 1112090003), *pro hac vice*
 9 Assistant Attorney General
 10 Office of the Attorney General of Maryland
 11 200 St. Paul Place
 12 Baltimore, MD 21202
 13 Phone: (410) 576-6417 (Mr. Ziperman)
 14 Phone: (410) 576-7226 (Ms. Stern)
 15 Fax: (410) 576-6566
 16 pziperman@oag.state.md.us
 17 estern@oag.state.md.us

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Office of the Attorney*
 19 *General of Maryland*

1 **KEITH ELLISON**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of Minnesota

4 /s/ Evan Romanoff
 5 Evan Romanoff (MN Bar No. 0398223)
 6 Assistant Attorney General
 7 Office of the Minnesota Attorney General
 8 445 Minnesota Street, Suite 600
 9 St. Paul, MN 55101
 10 Tel: (651) 728-4126
 11 evan.romanoff@ag.state.mn.us

12 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Minnesota*

13 **MICHAEL T. HILGERS**

14 Attorney General
 15 State of Nebraska

16 /s/ Colin P. Snider
 17 Colin P. Snider (NE #27724)
 18 Assistant Attorney General
 19 *pro hac vice*
 20 Nebraska Attorney General's Office
 21 2115 State Capitol Building
 22 Lincoln, NE 68509
 23 Phone: (402) 471-3840
 24 Email: michaela.hohwieler@nebraska.gov
 25 Email: colin.snider@nebraska.gov

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nebraska*

27 **MATTHEW J. PLATKIN**
 28 Attorney General
 29 State of New Jersey

30 By: /s/ Thomas Huynh
 31 Kashif T. Chand (NJ Bar No. 016752008),
 32 *pro hac vice*
 33 Section Chief, Deputy Attorney General
 34 Thomas Huynh (NJ Bar No. 200942017),
 35 *Pro hac vice*
 36 Assistant Section Chief, Deputy Attorney
 37 General
 38 Verna J. Pradaxay (NJ Bar No.
 39 335822021),
 40 *Pro hac vice*
 41 Mandy K. Wang (NJ Bar No. 373452021),
 42 *Pro hac vice*
 43 Deputy Attorneys General
 44 New Jersey Office of the Attorney General,
 45 Division of Law
 46 124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor
 47 Newark, NJ 07101
 48 Tel: (973) 648-2052
 49 Kashif.Chand@law.njoag.gov
 50 Thomas.Huynh@law.njoag.gov
 51 Verna.Pradaxay@law.njoag.gov
 52 Mandy.Wang@law.njoag.gov

53 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs New Jersey Attorney
 54 General and the New Jersey Division of
 55 Consumer Affairs, Matthew J. Platkin,
 56 Attorney General for the State of New
 57 Jersey, and Cari Fais, Director of the New
 58 Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs*

1 **LETITIA JAMES**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of New York

4 /s/ Kevin C. Wallace
 5 Kevin C. Wallace, Senior Enforcement
 6 Counsel
 7 (NY Bar No. 3988482), *pro hac vice*
 8 Alex Finkelstein, Assistant Attorney General
 9 (NY Bar No. 5609623), *pro hac vice*
 10 Nathaniel Kosslyn, Assistant Attorney
 11 General
 12 (NY Bar No. 5773676), *pro hac vice*
 13 New York Office of the Attorney General
 14 28 Liberty Street
 15 New York, NY 10005
 16 (212) 416-8000
 17 kevin.wallace@ag.ny.gov
 18 alex.finkelstein@ag.ny.gov
 19 nathaniel.kosslyn@ag.ny.gov

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State*
 21 *of New York*

22 **JOSHUA H. STEIN**
 23 Attorney General
 24 State of North Carolina

25 /s/ Charles White
 26 Joshua Abram
 27 Kunal Choksi
 28 Special Deputy Attorneys General
 29 Charles G. White
 30 Assistant Attorney General
 31 N.C. Department of Justice
 32 Post Office Box 629
 33 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602
 34 Telephone: (919) 716-6006
 35 Facsimile: (919) 716-6050
 36 cwhite@ncdoj.gov

37 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North*
 38 *Carolina*

1 **DAVE YOST**
 2 Attorney General
 3 State of Ohio

4 /s/ Kevin R. Walsh
 5 Melissa G. Wright (Ohio SBN 0077843)
 6 Section Chief, Consumer Protection Section
 7 Melissa S. Smith (Ohio SBN 0083551)
 8 Asst. Section Chief, Consumer Protection
 9 Section
 10 Michael S. Ziegler (Ohio SBN 0042206)
 11 Principal Assistant Attorney General
 12 Kevin R. Walsh (Ohio SBN 0073999)
 13 Senior Assistant Attorney General
 14 30 East Broad Street, 14th Floor
 15 Columbus, Ohio 43215
 16 614-466-1031
 17 Melissa.Wright@ohioago.gov
 18 Melissa.S.Smith@ohioago.gov
 19 Michael.Ziegler@ohioago.gov
 20 Kevin.Walsh@ohioago.gov

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Ohio*

22 **DAN RAYFIELD**
 23 Attorney General
 24 State of Oregon

25 /s/ John Dunbar
 26 John J. Dunbar (Oregon Bar No. 842100)
 27 Assistant Attorney General
 28 Oregon Department of Justice
 29 Consumer Protection Section
 30 100 SW Market Street
 31 Portland, Oregon 97201
 32 Telephone: (971) 673-1880
 33 Facsimile: (971) 673-1884
 34 E-mail: john.dunbar@doj.oregon.gov

35 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

1 **DAVID W. SUNDAY, JR.**
 2 Attorney General
 3 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

4 /s/ John M. Abel
 5 John M. Abel
 6 Senior Deputy Attorney General
 7 (PA Bar No. 47313), *pro hac vice*
 8 Jonathan R. Burns
 9 Deputy Attorney General
 10 (PA Bar No. 315206), *pro hac vice*
 11 jabel@attorneygeneral.gov
 12 jburns@attorneygeneral.gov
 13 Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General
 14 Strawberry Square, 14th Floor
 15 Harrisburg, PA 17120
 16 Tel: 717.645.7269

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the Commonwealth of*
 18 *Pennsylvania*

19 **PETER F. NERONHA**
 20 Attorney General
 21 State of Rhode Island

22 /s/ Stephen N. Provazza
 23 Stephen N. Provazza (R.I. Bar No. 10435),
 24 *pro hac vice*
 25 Assistant Attorney General
 26 Rhode Island Office of the Attorney General
 27 150 South Main St.
 28 Providence, RI 02903
 Phone: 401-274-4400
 Email: SProvazza@riag.ri.gov

29 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island*

30 **ALAN WILSON**
 31 Attorney General
 32 State of South Carolina

33 /s/ Clark Kirkland, Jr.
 34 C. Havird Jones, Jr.
 35 Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
 36 JARED Q. LIBET (SC Bar No. 74975)
 37 Assistant Deputy Attorney General
 38 Clark Kirkland Jr. (CA SBN 272522)
 39 Anna C. Smith (SC Bar No. 104749)
 40 Assistant Attorneys General
 41 Office of the South Carolina Attorney
 42 General
 43 Post Office Box 11549
 44 Columbia, South Carolina 29211
 45 jlibet@scag.gov
 46 ckirkland@scag.gov
 47 annasmith@scag.gov
 48 803-734-0057

49 *Attorneys for Plaintiff the State of*
 50 *South Carolina, ex rel. Alan M. Wilson, in*
 51 *His Official Capacity as*
 52 *Attorney General of the State of South*
 53 *Carolina*

54 **MARTY J. JACKLEY**
 55 Attorney General State of South Dakota

56 /s/ Amanda Miiller
 57 Amanda Miiller (D SBN 5613)
 58 Bret Leigh Nance (SD SBN 4271)
 59 *pro hac vice*
 60 Assistant Attorneys General
 61 1302 East Highway 14, Suite 1
 62 Pierre, SD 57501-8501
 63 Telephone: (605) 773-3215
 64 amanda.miiller@state.sd.us
 65 bretleigh.nance@state.sd.us

66 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of South Dakota*

1 **JASON S. MIYARES**
 2 Attorney General
 3 Commonwealth Of Virginia

4 /s/ Joelle E. Gotwals
 5 Steven G. Popps
 6 Chief Deputy Attorney General
 7 Thomas J. Sanford
 8 Deputy Attorney General
 9 Richard S. Schweiker, Jr.
 10 Senior Assistant Attorney General and
 11 Section Chief
 12 Joelle E. Gotwals (VSB No. 76779),
 13 *pro hac vice*
 14 Assistant Attorney General
 15 Office of the Attorney General of Virginia
 16 Consumer Protection Section
 17 202 N. 9th Street
 18 Richmond, Virginia 23219
 19 Telephone: (804) 786-8789
 20 Facsimile: (804) 786-0122
 21 E-mail: jgotwals@oag.state.va.us

22 *Attorneys for the Plaintiff Commonwealth of*
 23 *Virginia*
 24 *ex rel. Jason S. Miyares, Attorney General*

25 **NICHOLAS W. BROWN**
 26 Attorney General State of Washington

27 /s/ Alexandra Kory
 28 Alexandra Kory (WA Bar No. 49889),
 29 *pro hac vice*
 30 Joseph Kanada (WA Bar No. 55055),
 31 *pro hac vice*
 32 Rabi Lahiri
 33 Gardner Reed
 34 Claire McNamara
 35 Assistant Attorneys General
 36 Washington State Office of the Attorney
 37 General
 38 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
 39 Seattle, WA 98104
 40 (206) 516-2997
 41 Alexandra.kory@atg.wa.gov

42 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington*

43 **JOHN B. MCCUSKEY**
 44 Attorney General
 45 State Of West Virginia

46 /s/ Laurel K. Lackey
 47 Laurel K. Lackey
 48 Assistant Attorney General
 49 Office of the West Virginia Attorney
 50 General
 51 Eastern Panhandle Office
 52 269 Aikens Center
 53 Martinsburg, WV 25404
 54 304-267-0239
 55 304-267-0248 (facsimile)
 56 laurel.k.lackey@wvago.gov

57 *Attorney for the Plaintiff State of West*
 58 *Virginia*

59 **JOSHUA L. KAUL**
 60 Attorney General State of Wisconsin

61 /s/ Colin R. Stroud
 62 Colin R. Stroud
 63 Assistant Attorney General
 64 WI State Bar #1119457, *pro hac vice*
 65 Wisconsin Department of Justice
 66 Post Office Box 7857
 67 Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857
 68 (608) 261-9224
 69 strouder@doj.state.wi.us

70 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

1 **ATTESTATION**

2 I hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of
3 this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

4
5 DATED: February 3, 2025

By: /s/ Marissa Roy

6 Marissa Roy

7 *Attorney for the People of the State*
8 *of California*

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

3 I hereby certify that on February 3, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document
4 with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system.

By: /s/ Marissa Roy

Marissa Roy

*Attorney for the People of the State of
California*